

Pales.

The Partition Of Palestine

By CHARLES R. WATSON, D.D., LL.D.



WHAT are the factors that have led to the present American support of the Partition of Palestine?

Ignorance And Indifference Of Americans Criticized

First, there is the ignorance and indifference of Americans generally. These have grown weary of the incessant reports of murders and killings by Zionist underground forces and have said, "Let us have a change. This present plan is evidently unworkable. It does not represent peace." So they have consented to Partition and have assumed that the Arabs would acquiesce in this plan and the world would have peace in Palestine.

Present events show how mistaken they are. The Arabs are not going to take this decision "lying down," as a leading authority has put it. Casualties on both sides are being suffered each day in Palestine and will rise steadily in coming months and years. As has been conceded, the Arabs are experts at guerrilla warfare and the United Nations will have no more success in suppressing the Arabs than the British have had with the opposite plan of suppressing the underground Jews. Nor does this theory reckon with what is going to happen to outlying helpless colonies of Jews now established peacefully in Arab and Moslem communities. We have already heard of attacks upon Jews in Aden and in many other parts of the Middle East. But for Zionism and the Partition issue, these have hitherto lived in peace with surrounding Moslems as "people of the Book." What right has the American-inspired policy of Partition to endanger the lives and perhaps invite the extinction of the thousands of those innocent and helpless Jews, scattered throughout the Moslem world?

Americans Mistaken In Thinking All Jews Zionists

Another factor which I find in the American support of the Partition of Palestine plan is the mistaken idea that all Jews desire the establishment of a political and national Jewish state in Palestine, that is, that all Jews are Zionists. This is very far from the truth. It is a question whether even a majority of Jews in the U.S.A. favor a national or political state in Palestine. Perhaps the readers of this article will have noted the action taken at the annual meeting of the Temple Emanu-El in New York City, one of the most important Jewish congregations in New York, repudiating in a public statement the claims of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations to represent them. This illustrates a device and propaganda much used by Zionists, i.e., to foster the impression that all Jews agree with their views and that to be a Jew is to be a Zionist.

Zionist Movement Repudiated By Many Jews

Far from it. Whole books, such as Rabbi Emil Berger's, "The Jewish Dilemma," have been written opposing this political idea of the Zionists. The Zionist movement is less than a hundred years old. It was as purely philanthropic, not as political, movements that the efforts of Rothschild and Montefiore and Montague were motivated in establishing colonies of Jews in Palestine. The recent public utterances of President Magnus, head of the Hebrew university at Jerusalem, and the public advertisements of Dr. L. J. Rosenwald, president of the American Council for Judaism, opposing the Zionist program are illustrations of the widespread repudiation by many Jews of the political interpretations put upon the Balfour statement by Zionists. Of

course, it is not to be denied that Zionism can show a large number of adherents in New York City especially, and that it is extremely vocal.

The Jewish group is in reality divisible into three groups: the old-time group with which Christians have had chief contact and Christian fellowship, and which does not follow the political interpretations and ambitions of the Zionists; secondly, the political extremists who are all for a political Jewish State, even if secured by force as we have witnessed; third, a great majority of Jews who follow no party and are indifferent to the question as they have no intention to exchange American citizenship for Palestinian citizenship, Jews who are swayed by the leaders of their communities and who are the prey of an active Zionist propaganda.

Partition Supporters Overlook Atlantic Charter

An important element in the present situation that has been overlooked by American supporters of Partition is the extent to which it ignores the Atlantic Charter. Preceding the UN, and yet enunciating the basic conceptions that led to the UN, are the declarations of the Atlantic Charter to which Franklin D. Roosevelt committed America as did Winston Churchill for Great Britain. The second Article of this important declaration specifically states: "Our countries desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned." Yet the Partition of Palestine is an open defiance of the wishes of 1,206,000 Arabs, a clear and overwhelming majority, as against some 648,000 Jews.

It will be argued by some that the Atlantic Charter provisions are irrelevant and that we should make reference only to the Charter of the United Nations. If so, Chapter XII of the UN charter, that deals with the "International Trusteeship System" of the UN, may be appealed to. Here Article 79 declares that the terms of trusteeship shall be subject to the agreement of the previous mandatory power. Yet, contrary to the declared statement of Great Britain, that any plan it would support must be agreeable to both Jew and Arab, a Partition plan is adopted which is contrary to the wishes of a clear majority in Palestine.

Injustice To Arab Population Unworthily Ignored

This unjust and illegal action was further forced through by political methods that the Arabs and others rightly described as "nauseating," and which for America were unworthy of her reputation for fairness and justice. So unjust was this Partition plan that several nations declined to

be party to its enactment. So it hung in the balance for week after week until, if we believe Drew Pearson, the President called in leaders of the State department and required them to swing enough votes from minor nations that depended heavily on the U.S., to pass the odious recommendation. So Liberia voted for it and the Philippines and Haiti until the required majority was secured. By such unworthy methods was law coerced to support Partition.

As a further legal point, it may be remembered that President Truman in his official recommendation of Partition argues for his and America's right to enforce upon Palestine this Partition plan, because America shared in World War I which delivered Palestine from enemy (in this case Turkish) control. As if this gave America the right to dispose as it pleased of a nation thus liberated! What then of France and Belgium and Holland? Will America argue for a right to dispose of their boundaries and governments without their consent because she shared in a war that set them free?

Is Portition Fulmilt Of Prophecy?

There remains one further argument for Partition that we fear has weighed with many good citizens who, while utterly removed from any share in America's policy, have hesitated to express any opposition to a policy which at heart they knew to be unjust. To many Bible students of the Prophetic school, the Partition of Palestine seems to be the fulfillment of the prophecies concerning the return of the Jews to Palestine. They therefore would not be found fighting against the purposes of God. To this position all that is needed is to point out the hopelessly un-moral and unethical character of the dominant Zionist elements that have permitted murders and violence to gain their possession of Palestine. It is not in our view of God that we should cooperate with evil-minded men in advancing the stages of God's redemptive plan and ushering in the Kingdom. It will not be through channels that are materialistic, in many cases atheistic, that a God of spirituality and righteousness will mediate to the world his gracious truth and blameless light of the knowledge of God.

Is Portition A Practical Solution?

Turning aside from the more theoretical side of justice and fairness in the proposed Partition plan, it will be worth while to consider this measure from the side of practicability. Looking at the map, is there any prospect or hope of this plan's being a success? Palestine is a small area in its totality, about the size of Vermont state. It is proposed to divide this small territory in zigzag pattern into two states which make the Jewish area still smaller. This small area will be less than one third of Switzerland, about the size of Connecticut. Picture Connecticut surrounded by hostile states, having hostile to it on three sides Massachusetts, New York

and Rhode Island, refusing to it trade or commercial privileges of any sort and with no outlet for its political or civilian life save by ocean travel to Europe. Would anyone be sanguine as to its success? The truth is that unless this future Jewish Palestine be constantly maintained by the "river of gold" which now flows from America to Palestine, its hope for future success and financial independence is less than nothing.

Every prophecy of the future success of a Jewish Palestine rests upon the false assumption of a cooperating Arab *milieu* for this Jewish state. Those of us who know the Arab and his feeling know that there is no hope of this changed attitude, but are apprehensive for the innocent and helpless Jewish colonies scattered throughout the Moslem world now likely to become victims of the righteous indignation of Arabs.

Americans Should Not Become Entangled In Problem

The question, however, on its practical side often takes the form, What else have you to propose? It is not for this article to answer that question. Its purpose is to keep Americans from becoming nationally entangled in a difficult problem whose solution has baffled so many wise men of both the East and the West. Certain points seem clear. One is that the whole Palestine problem would disappear if the "river of gold" now flowing from America to Palestine were arrested. Apart from it, the whole situation would become normalized as before World Wars I and II, save for a negligible remnant who inherit the Maccabean spirit and ideology. Another fact is that apart from the political ambition of the Jew to create a political entity out of Arab territory there is no Palestine problem. For centuries Arab and Jew have lived in amity side by side, but the Arab will not tolerate Jewish political domination. Down that road lie 13 centuries of ill will, guerrilla warfare and hostility to American and Western progressiveness.

Already counter proposals are in the air. One is the Minority Report of the UN Committee on Partition. Another is the insistence of intelligent Americans that nationally we shall have no part in this thorny question and that no government official shall have the right to involve us in Partition or other plan. Recently, a letter in the *New York Times* by a Britisher who claims a part in the original Balfour promise, urges a combined Arab-Jewish government with civil rights to Arab and Jew alike under such a union government. The writer of this article has advocated that the question be referred to the UN's own International Court of Justice to determine whether the Partition plan is not contrary to the functions of the UN as defined by its own Charter and Constitution. The main point of this article is to set America free from the odium and the future increasing resentment of all Arab nations because of her political pro-Zion and anti-Arab bias in the future Palestine.

This is an article written by Dr. Watson the day before his death on January 10, 1948. As Dr. Watson lived, so he died with a great concern for the Moslems of Egypt and of the world.